

A DISCRETIZED APPROACH TO W. T. GOWERS' GAME

V. KANELLOPOULOS AND K. TYROS

ABSTRACT. We give an alternative proof of W. T. Gowers' theorem on block bases by reducing it to a discrete analogue on specific countable nets. We also give a Ramsey type result on k -tuples of block sequences in a normed linear space with a Schauder basis.

1. INTRODUCTION

W. T. Gowers in [11] (see also [10] and [12]) proved a fundamental Ramsey-type theorem for block bases in Banach spaces which led to important discoveries in the geometry of Banach spaces. By now there are several approaches to Gowers' theorem (see [1, 2, 3, 4, 14, 21]. Also in [7, 15, 18] there are direct proofs of Gowers' dichotomy and in [6, 8, 19, 22, 24] extensions and further applications).

Our aim in this note is to state and prove a discrete analogue of Gowers' theorem which is free of approximations. To state our results we will need the following notation. Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a real linear space with an infinite countable Hamel basis $(e_n)_n$ (actually the field over which the linear space $\mathfrak{X}$ is defined plays no role in the arguments; it is only for the sake of convenience that we will assume that $\mathfrak{X}$ is a real linear space). For a subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{X}$ by $\langle A \rangle$ we denote the linear span of A . Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a subset of $\mathfrak{X}$. By $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ we denote the set of all block sequences $(x_n)_n$ with $x_n \in \mathfrak{D}$ for all n . For a block sequence $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z)$ be the set of all block sequences of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ which are block subsequences of Z .

Assume that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ is non empty and let $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$. We define the $\mathfrak{D}$ -Gowers' game in Z , denoted by $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$, as follows. Player I starts the game by choosing $W_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z)$ and player II responds with a vector $w_0 \in \langle W_0 \rangle \cap \mathfrak{D}$. Then player I chooses $W_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z)$ and player II chooses a vector $w_1 \in \langle W_1 \rangle \cap \mathfrak{D}$ and so on. Player II wins the game if the sequence $(w_0, w_1, \dots)$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}$.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{D}$ is a subset of $\mathfrak{X}$ satisfying the following properties.

- (D1) (*Asymptotic property*) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{D} \cap \langle (e_i)_{i \geq n} \rangle \neq \emptyset$.
- (D2) (*Finitization property*) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\mathfrak{D} \cap \langle (e_i)_{i < n} \rangle$ is finite.

Property (D1) simply means that the set of all block sequences $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ is non empty. Property (D2) implies that $\mathfrak{D}$ is countable. Hence, endowing $\mathfrak{D}$ with the discrete topology, the space $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of all infinite countable sequences of $\mathfrak{D}$ equipped with the product topology is a Polish space. We can now state our first main result.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a real linear space with a countable Hamel basis $(e_n)_n$ and let $\mathfrak{D} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}$ satisfying properties (D1) and (D2). Also let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ be an analytic*

¹2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 05D10, 46B03

²Research supported by PEBE 2007.

Key words and phrases. Ramsey theory, games in Banach spaces.

subset of $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then for every $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ there exists $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that either $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z) \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$ or player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{G}$.

While discrete in nature, Theorem 1 can be used to derive Gowers' original result provided that $\mathfrak{D}$ satisfies an additional property (see Section 4).

Our second main result concerns k -tuples of block sequences in normed linear spaces with a Schauder basis. Precisely, let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a real normed linear space with a Schauder basis $(e_n)_n$. By $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$ we shall denote the set of block sequences of $\mathfrak{X}$ and by $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty}$ the set of all block sequences in the unit ball $B_{\mathfrak{X}}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$. Two block sequences $Z_1 = (z_n^1)_n$ and $Z_2 = (z_n^2)_n$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$ are said to be *disjointly supported* if $\text{supp } z_n^1 \cap \text{supp } z_m^2 = \emptyset$ for all m, n . For a positive integer $k \geq 2$ and for every $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$, the set of all k -tuples consisting of pairwise disjointly supported block subsequences of Z in $B_{\mathfrak{X}}$ will be denoted by $(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty}(Z))_{\perp}^k$. Also, for a family $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty})^k$ of k -tuples of block sequences of $\mathfrak{X}$, the *upwards closure* of $\mathfrak{F}$ is defined to be the set

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\uparrow} = \left\{ (U_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty})^k : \exists (V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in \mathfrak{F} \text{ such that } \forall i \ V_i \text{ is a block subsequence of } U_i \right\}$$

If $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ is a sequence of positive reals, then the Δ -*expansion* of $\mathfrak{F}$ is defined to be the set

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\Delta} = \left\{ (U_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty})^k : \exists (V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in \mathfrak{F} \text{ such that } \forall i \ \text{dist}(U_i, V_i) \leq \Delta \right\}.$$

We prove the following.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a real normed linear space with a Schauder basis, $k \geq 2$ and $\mathfrak{F}$ be an analytic subset of $(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty})^k$. Then for every sequence of positive real numbers $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ there is $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$ such that either $(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty}(Y))_{\perp}^k \cap \mathfrak{F} = \emptyset$ or $(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty}(Y))^k \subseteq (\mathfrak{F}_{\Delta})^{\uparrow}$.*

In the above theorem the topology of $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty}$ is the induced one by the product of the norm topology. Theorem 2 applied for $k=2$ and the family

$$\mathfrak{F} = \{(U_1, U_2) \in (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty})^2 : U_1, U_2 \text{ are } C\text{-equivalent}\}$$

where $C \geq 1$ is a constant, yields Gowers' second dichotomy (see Lemma 7.3 in [11]).

2. NOTATION.

Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a real linear space with an infinite countable Hamel basis $(e_n)_n$. For two non zero vectors x, y in $\mathfrak{X}$, we write $x < y$ if $\max \text{supp } x < \min \text{supp } y$, (where $\text{supp } x$ is the *support* of x , i.e. if $x = \sum_n \lambda_n e_n$ then $\text{supp } x = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \neq 0\}$). A sequence $(x_n)_n$ of vectors in $\mathfrak{X}$ is called a *block sequence* (or *block basis*) if $x_n < x_{n+1}$ for all n .

Capital letters (such as $U, V, Y, Z, \dots$) refer to infinite block sequences and lower case letters with a line over them (such as $\overline{u}, \overline{v}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}, \dots$) to finite block sequences. We write $Y \preceq Z$ to denote that Y is a *block subsequence* of Z , that is $Y = (y_n)_n$, $Z = (z_n)_n$ are block sequences and for all n , $y_n \in \langle (z_i)_i \rangle$. The notation $\overline{y} \preceq \overline{z}$ and $\overline{y} \preceq \overline{z}$ are defined analogously. For $\overline{x} = (x_n)_{n=0}^k$ and $Y = (y_n)_n$ we write $\overline{x} < Y$, if $x_k < y_0$. For $\overline{x} < Y$, $\overline{x} \frown Y$ denotes the block sequence $(z_n)_n$ that starts with the elements of $\overline{x}$ and continues with these of Y . Also for $\overline{x} < \overline{y}$, the finite block sequence $\overline{x} \frown \overline{y}$ is similarly defined. For a block sequence $Z = (z_n)_n$ and an

infinite subset L of $\mathbb{N}$ we set $Z|_L = (z_n)_{n \in L}$. Also for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z|_k = (z_n)_{n=0}^{k-1}$ (where for $k = 0$, $Z|_0 = \emptyset$).

Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a subset of $\mathfrak{X}$. By $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}$) we denote the set of all infinite (resp. finite) block sequences $(x_n)_n$ with $x_n \in \mathfrak{D}$ for all n . The set of all infinite (resp. finite) block sequences in $\mathfrak{X}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{<\infty}$). For $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$ we set $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z) = \{Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty} : Y \preceq Z\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z) = \{\bar{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty} : \bar{y} \preceq Z\}$. Similarly for $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{<\infty}$, $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(\bar{z}) = \{\bar{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty} : \bar{y} \preceq \bar{z}\}$. For a block sequence $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$, we set $\langle Z \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}} = \langle Z \rangle \cap \mathfrak{D}$ where $\langle Z \rangle$ is the linear span of Z .

3. DISCRETIZATION OF GOWERS' GAME.

Throughout this section, $\mathfrak{X}$ is a real linear space with countable Hamel basis $(e_n)_n$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ is a subset of $\mathfrak{X}$ satisfying properties $(\mathfrak{D}1)$ and $(\mathfrak{D}2)$ as stated in the Introduction. Notice that $(\mathfrak{D}2)$ also gives that for every $U = (u_i)_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}((u_i)_{i < n})$ is finite.

3.1. Admissible families of $\mathfrak{D}$ -pairs. The aim of this subsection is to review the methods that we will follow to handle the several diagonalizations that will appear (see also [11], [20]). A $\mathfrak{D}$ -pair is a pair $(\bar{x}, Y)$ where $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$. For $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$, a family $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(U) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ is called *admissible family of $\mathfrak{D}$ -pairs in U* if it satisfies the next properties:

- (P1) (*Heredity*) If $(\bar{x}, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ then $(\bar{x}, Z) \in \mathcal{P}$.
- (P2) (*Cofinality*) For every $(\bar{x}, Y) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(U) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$, there is $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ such that $(\bar{x}, Z) \in \mathcal{P}$.

For simplicity in the sequel when we write “pair” we will always mean a “ $\mathfrak{D}$ -pair”. It will often happen that an admissible family of pairs has one more property.

- (P3) If $(\bar{x}, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$, $\bar{x} < Y$ and $k = \min\{m : \bar{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}((u_i)_{i=1}^m)\}$ then for every $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}((u_i)_{i=1}^k)$, $(\bar{x}, \bar{y} \frown Y) \in \mathcal{P}$.

The next lemma follows by a standard diagonalization argument.

Lemma 3. *Let $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ and let $\mathcal{P}$ be an admissible family of pairs in U . Then there is $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that for all $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$ and all $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ with $\bar{w} < Y$, $(\bar{w}, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$. If in addition $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies (P3) then for all $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$, $(\bar{w}, W) \in \mathcal{P}$.*

3.2. The discrete Gowers' game. Given $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ and a family of infinite block sequences $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$, we define the $\mathfrak{D}$ -Gowers' game, $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Y)$, as follows. Player I starts the game by choosing $Z_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ and player II responses with a vector $z_0 \in \langle Z_0 \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}}$. Then player I chooses $Z_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ and player II chooses a vector $z_1 \in \langle Z_1 \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}}$ with $z_0 < z_1$ and so on. More generally for a finite block sequence $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ the game $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(\bar{x}, Y)$ is defined as above with the additional condition that player II in the first move chooses $z_0 > \bar{x}$. Clearly $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(\emptyset, Y)$ is identical to $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Y)$. We will say that player II *wins the game $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(\bar{x}, Y)$ for $\mathcal{G}$* if the block sequence $\bar{x} \frown (z_0, z_1, \dots)$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}$.

The basic terminology that we shall use is an adaptation of the classical Galvin-Prikry's one (cf. [9], [5]) in the frame of Gowers' game. More precisely, for $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}$, $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ we say that Y $\mathcal{G}$ -accepts $\bar{x}$ if player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(\bar{x}, Y)$ for $\mathcal{G}$ and that Y $\mathcal{G}$ -rejects $\bar{x}$ if there is no $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ which $\mathcal{G}$ -accepts $\bar{x}$. We also say that Y $\mathcal{G}$ -decides $\bar{x}$ if either Y $\mathcal{G}$ -accepts $\bar{x}$ or Y $\mathcal{G}$ -rejects $\bar{x}$.

Notice that if $\bar{x} = \emptyset$ then to say that “ Y $\mathcal{G}$ -accepts the empty sequence” means that player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Y)$ for $\mathcal{G}$. Similarly the statement that “ Y $\mathcal{G}$ -rejects the empty sequence” is equivalent to that for all $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ player II has no winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{G}$. The following lemma is easily verified.

Lemma 4. *For every $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ and every $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$, the family*

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(\bar{x}, Y) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(U) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U) : Y \text{ } \mathcal{G} \text{ -- decides } \bar{x}\}$$

is an admissible family of pairs in U which in addition satisfies property (P3).

Actually the family $\mathcal{P}$ of the above lemma satisfies the following stronger than (P3) property: If $(\bar{x}, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ such that there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $Z|_{[n, \infty)} \preceq Y$, then $(\bar{x}, Z) \in \mathcal{P}$.

For the sake of simplicity in the following we will omit the letter $\mathcal{G}$ in front of the words “accepts”, “rejects” and “decides”. The next lemma is a consequence of Lemma 4 and Lemma 3.

Lemma 5. *For every $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ there is $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that for all $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$, W decides $\bar{w}$.*

The crucial point at which the above notions of “accept-reject” essentially differ from the original ones reveals in the next lemma. Here the notion of the winning strategy replaces successfully the traditional pigeonhole principle.

Lemma 6. *Let $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ such that W decides all $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$ and assume that there is $\bar{w}_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ such that W rejects $\bar{w}_0$. Then for every $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ there is $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ such that for every $z \in < Z >_{\mathfrak{D}}$ with $\bar{w}_0 < z$, W rejects $\bar{w}_0 \hat{\smallfrown} z$.*

Proof. If the conclusion is false then there is $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ such that for every $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ there is $z \in < Z >_{\mathfrak{D}}$ with $\bar{w}_0 < z$ such that W accepts $\bar{w}_0 \hat{\smallfrown} z$. It is easy to see that this means that player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(\bar{w}_0, Y)$ for $\mathcal{G}$ and thus Y accepts $\bar{w}_0$. But this is a contradiction since $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ and W rejects $\bar{w}_0$. $\square$

Lemma 7. *For every $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ there exists $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that either Z rejects all $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$ or player II has winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5 there is $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that for every $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$, W decides $\bar{w}$. If W accepts the empty sequence then we readily have the second alternative of the conclusion for $Z = W$. In the opposite case consider the following family in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(\bar{x}, Y) : \text{Either } W \text{ accepts } \bar{x} \text{ or } \forall y \in < Y >_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{ with } \bar{x} < y, W \text{ rejects } \bar{x} \hat{\smallfrown} y\}$$

Using Lemma 6 we easily verify that $\mathcal{P}$ is an admissible family in W which satisfies also property (P3). Hence by Lemma 3 there is $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ such that for every $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$, $(\bar{z}, Z) \in \mathcal{P}$. By our assumption W rejects the empty sequence. Hence since $(\emptyset, Z) \in \mathcal{P}$ we have that W and so Z rejects all $z \in < Z >_{\mathfrak{D}}$. By induction on the length of finite block sequences in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$, it is easily shown that Z rejects all $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$. $\square$

We have finally arrived at our first stop which is an analog of the well known result of Nash-Williams ([17]). Consider the set $\mathfrak{D}$ as a topological space with the discrete topology and $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the product topology.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ be open in $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then for every $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ there exists $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that either $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z) \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$ or player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7 we can find $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that either Z rejects all $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$, or player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{G}$. Hence it suffices to show that the first alternative gives that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z) \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$. Indeed, let $W = (w_n)_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z)$. Then for all k , Z rejects $W|_k = (w_n)_{n < k}$. Therefore there is some $Z_k \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z)$ with $W|_k < Z_k$ such that $W|_k \wedge Z_k \notin \mathcal{G}$. Since the sequence $(W|_k \wedge Z_k)_k$ converges in $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to W and the complement of $\mathcal{G}$ is closed, we conclude that $W \notin \mathcal{G}$. $\square$

We pass now to the case of an analytic family $\mathcal{G}$. First let us state some basic definitions (cf. [13]). Let $\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of all finite sequences in $\mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{N}$ be the Baire space i.e. the space of all infinite sequences in $\mathbb{N}$ with the topology generated by the sets $\mathcal{N}_s = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{N} : \exists n \text{ with } \sigma|n = s\}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$. A subset of a Polish space X is called *analytic* if it is the image of a continuous function from $\mathcal{N}$ into X .

For the next lemmas we fix the following.

- (a) A family $(\mathcal{G}^s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}}$ of subsets of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ such that for all s , $\mathcal{G}^s = \bigcup_n \mathcal{G}^{s \wedge n}$.
- (b) A bijection $\varphi : \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi(\emptyset) = 0$ and for all s, n , $\varphi(s \wedge n) > \varphi(s)$.

For each $\bar{x}$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}$ we set $s_{\bar{x}}$ to be the unique element element of $\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\varphi(s_{\bar{x}})$ equals to the length of $\bar{x}$. For a $\mathfrak{D}$ -pair $(\bar{x}, Y)$ we set

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{x}, Y) = \{V \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty} : \exists k \text{ such that } V|_k = \bar{x} \text{ and } V|_{[k, \infty)} \preceq Y\}$$

Finally, recall the following terminology from [11]. For a family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ we say that $\mathcal{G}$ is *large for* $(\bar{x}, Y)$ if for all $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$, $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{x}, Z) \neq \emptyset$. In the case $\bar{x} = \emptyset$ we simply say that $\mathcal{G}$ is large for Y .

Lemma 9. *For every $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ there is $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that for every $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$, either $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{w}, W) = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}}}$ is large for $(\bar{w}, W)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all pairs $(\bar{x}, Y)$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(U) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ such that either $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{x}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{x}, Y) = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{x}}}$ is large for $(\bar{x}, Y)$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{P}$ is admissible satisfying property (P3). Hence the conclusion follows by Lemma 3. $\square$

Let $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}$ be a block sequence in $\mathfrak{D}$ satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 9. For $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$, let $\mathcal{F}(\bar{w})$ be the family of all $V = (v_i)_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ with $\bar{w} < V$ and the following properties. There exist $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ with $l \geq 1$ such that

- (i) $s_{\bar{w}} \wedge m = s_{\bar{x}}$, where $\bar{x} = \bar{w} \wedge (v_i)_{i=0}^{l-1}$ and
- (ii) The family $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}} \wedge m}$ is large for $(\bar{w} \wedge (v_i)_{i=0}^{l-1}, W)$.

Notice that $\mathcal{F}(\bar{w})$ is open in $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 10. *Let $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$ and assume that $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}}}$ is large for $(\bar{w}, W)$. Then $\mathcal{F}(\bar{w})$ is large for W .*

Proof. Let $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$. Since $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}}}$ is large for $(\bar{w}, W)$ there is $V = (v_i)_i$ such that $\bar{w} < V$ and $\bar{w} \wedge V \in \mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{w}, Z) = \bigcup_m \mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}} \wedge m} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{w}, Z)$ and so for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{w} \wedge V \in \mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}} \wedge m} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{w}, Z)$. Notice that for $l = \varphi(s \wedge m) - \varphi(s)$ we have that $s_{\bar{w}} \wedge m = s_{\bar{x}}$, where $\bar{x} = \bar{w} \wedge (v_i)_{i=0}^{l-1}$, and $\bar{w} \wedge V \in \mathcal{G}^{s_{\bar{w}} \wedge m} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\bar{w} \wedge (v_i)_{i=0}^{l-1}, Z)$. Therefore

$\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}m} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\overline{w} \frown (v_i)_{i=0}^{l-1}, W) \neq \emptyset$ which (by the properties of W) means that $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}m}$ is large for $(\overline{w} \frown (v_i)_{i=0}^{l-1}, W)$. Hence $V \in \mathcal{F}(\overline{w}) \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z)$. $\square$

Lemma 11. *There is $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ such that for every $\overline{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$ we have that either $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\overline{z}, Z) = \emptyset$ or player II has a winning strategy in the game $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for the family $\mathcal{F}(\overline{z})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the family of pairs $(\overline{w}, Y) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ such that either $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\overline{w}, Y) = \emptyset$ or player II has a winning strategy in the game $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Y)$ for the family $\mathcal{F}(\overline{w})$.

By Lemma 3 it suffices to show that $\mathcal{P}$ is an admissible family of pairs in W which in addition satisfies property (P3). It is easy to see that only the cofinality property needs some explanation. To this end let $(\overline{w}, Y) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$. Since $\overline{w} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(W)$ we have that either $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\overline{w}, W) = \emptyset$, or $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}}$ is large for $(\overline{w}, W)$. In the first case, $\mathcal{G}^{s_{\overline{w}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\overline{w}, Y) = \emptyset$ and so $(\overline{w}, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$. In the second case, Lemma 10 implies that $\mathcal{F}(\overline{w})$ is large for W . Hence by Lemma 8, there is $V \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Y)$ such that player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(V)$ for $\mathcal{F}(\overline{w})$ and so $(\overline{w}, V) \in \mathcal{P}$. $\square$

We are now ready for the proof of the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1: Assume that there is no $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ such that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z) \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$, that is $\mathcal{G}$ is large for U . Let $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a continuous map with $f[\mathcal{N}] = \mathcal{G}$ and for $s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$, let $\mathcal{G}^s = f[\mathcal{N}_s]$. Then $\mathcal{G}^{\emptyset} = \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}^s = \bigcup_n \mathcal{G}^{s \frown n}$. Following the process of the above lemmas let $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(U)$ be as in Lemma 9 and $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ as in Lemma 11. We claim that player II has a winning strategy in the game $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{G}$.

Indeed, by our assumption $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{\emptyset}$ is large in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(Z) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(\emptyset, Z)$ and so player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{F}(\emptyset)$. This means that player II is able to produce after a finite number of moves, a finite block sequence $\overline{y}_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$ such that there is $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, with $s_{\overline{y}_0} = (m_0)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(m_0)}$ large for $(\overline{y}_0, W)$. By Lemma 11, player II has a winning strategy in $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{F}(\overline{y}_0)$, that is player II can extend $\overline{y}_0$ to a finite block sequence $\overline{y}_0 \frown \overline{y}_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{<\infty}(Z)$ such that there is $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s_{\overline{y}_0 \frown \overline{y}_1} = (m_0, m_1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(m_0, m_1)}$ is large for $(\overline{y}_0 \frown \overline{y}_1, W)$.

Continuing in this way we conclude that player II has a strategy in the game $G_{\mathfrak{D}}(Z)$ to construct a block sequence $Y = \overline{y}_0 \frown \overline{y}_1 \frown \dots$ such that for some $\sigma = (m_i)_i \in \mathcal{N}$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{G}^{\sigma|k}$ is large for $((\overline{y}_0 \frown \dots \frown \overline{y}_{k-1}), W)$. To show that this is actually a winning strategy for $\mathcal{G}$ we have to prove that $Y \in \mathcal{G}$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mathcal{G}^{\sigma|k}$ is large for $((\overline{y}_0 \frown \dots \frown \overline{y}_{k-1}), W)$, we have that there exists $Y_k \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\infty}(W)$ such that $(\overline{y}_0 \frown \dots \frown \overline{y}_{k-1}) \frown Y_k \in \mathcal{G}^{\sigma|k}$. Since $(\mathcal{G}^{\sigma|n})_n$ is decreasing, $Y = \lim_n (\overline{y}_0 \frown \dots \frown \overline{y}_{n-1}) \frown Y_n \in \overline{\mathcal{G}^{\sigma|k}}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus $Y \in \bigcap_k \overline{\mathcal{G}^{\sigma|k}}$. By the continuity of f , $\bigcap_k \overline{\mathcal{G}^{\sigma|k}} = \{f(\sigma)\}$ and therefore $Y = f(\sigma) \in \mathcal{G}$. $\square$

4. PASSING FROM THE DISCRETE TO GOWERS' GAME.

In this section we will see how using Theorem 1 one can derive W. T. Gowers' Ramsey theorem (see Theorem 16). From now on and for all the rest of this note $\mathfrak{X}$ will be a normed linear space with a Schauder basis $(e_n)_n$.

First let us recall some relevant definitions. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\infty}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\infty}$) be the set of all block sequences in $\mathfrak{X}$ (resp. in the unit ball $B_{\mathfrak{X}}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$). Let $U = (u_n)_n, V =$

$(v_n)_n \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ and $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ a sequence of positive real numbers. We say that U, V are Δ -near and we write $\text{dist}(U, V) \leq \Delta$ if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|u_n - v_n\| \leq \delta_n$. For a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ and a sequence $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ of positive real numbers the Δ -expansion of $\mathcal{F}$ is the set

$$\mathcal{F}_\Delta = \{U \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty : \exists V \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } \text{dist}(U, V) \leq \Delta\}$$

For $Y \in \mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ and a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ the Gowers' game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Y)$ is defined as the $\mathfrak{D}$ -Gowers game by replacing $\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$ with the unit ball $B_\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ respectively.

For the next two lemmas we fix the following.

- (i) A subset $\mathfrak{D}$ of $\langle e_n \rangle_n$ satisfying the asymptotic property ($\mathfrak{D}1$).
- (ii) A family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ of block sequences in $B_\mathfrak{X}$,
- (iii) A sequence $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ of positive real numbers.

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_\Delta \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$ and suppose that for some $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$, $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z}) \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$. Assume that there exist $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ such that*

$$\mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z}))_\Delta$$

(that is for every block subsequence $U = (u_n)_n$ of Z with $\|u_n\| \leq 1$ there is a block subsequence $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{u}_n)_n$ of $\tilde{Z}$ with $\tilde{u}_n \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\text{dist}(U, \tilde{U}) \leq \Delta$).

Then $\mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z) \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $U \in \mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z)$. By our assumptions there is $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z})$ such that $\text{dist}(U, \tilde{U}) \leq \Delta$ and $\tilde{U} \notin \mathcal{G}$. Then $U \notin \mathcal{F}$, otherwise $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{F}_\Delta \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z})$ which is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 13. *Let $\delta_0 \leq 1$ and $\sum_{j=n+1}^\infty \delta_j \leq \delta_n$, for all n . Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_{\Delta/10C} \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$, where C is the basis constant of $\langle e_n \rangle_n$ and suppose that for some $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$ player II has a winning strategy in the discrete game $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$ for $\mathcal{G}$. Assume that there exist $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ such that*

$$\mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z}))_{\Delta/10C}$$

Then player II has a winning strategy in Gowers' game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{F}_\Delta$.

Proof. We will define a winning strategy for player II in Gowers' game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{F}_\Delta$ provided that he has one in the discrete game $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$ for $\mathcal{G}$. Suppose that we have just completed the n -th move of the game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ (resp. of the discrete game $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$) and $x_0 < \dots < x_{n-1}$ (resp. $\tilde{x}_0 < \dots < \tilde{x}_{n-1}$) have been chosen by player II in $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ (resp. in $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$).

Suppose that in the game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ player I chooses a block sequence $Z_n = (z_k^n)_k \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty(Z)$. By normalizing we may suppose that for every k , $\|z_k^n\| = 1$ and so by our assumptions for $\tilde{Z}$ and Z there exists $\tilde{Z}_n = (\tilde{z}_k^n)_k \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z})$ such that $\text{dist}(Z_n, \tilde{Z}_n) \leq \Delta/10C$. Then for all k , $\|z_k^n - \tilde{z}_k^n\| \leq \delta_k/10C$ and so $\|\tilde{z}_k^n\| \geq 1 - \delta_k/10C$. Let $k_0 \geq n$ be such that $x_{n-1} < z_{k_0}^n$ and let player I play $\tilde{Z}_n|_{[k_0, \infty)} = (\tilde{z}_k^n)_{k \geq k_0}$ in the n^{th} -move of the discrete game $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$. Then player II extends $(\tilde{x}_0, \dots, \tilde{x}_{n-1})$ according to his strategy in $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$ for $\mathcal{G}$, by picking $\tilde{x}_n \in \langle (\tilde{z}_k^n)_{k \geq k_0} \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}}$. Then $\tilde{x}_n = \sum_{k \in I_n} \lambda_k^n \tilde{z}_k^n$, where I_n is a finite segment in $\mathbb{N}$ with $\min I_n \geq k_0$ and $\lambda_k^n \in \mathbb{R}$. Going back to Gowers' game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ let player II play $x_n = \sum_{k \in I_n} \lambda_k^n z_k^n$. Then $x_n > x_{n-1}$ and so player II forms in this way a block sequence in $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty(Z)$.

It remains to show that $(x_n)_n \in \mathcal{F}_\Delta$. Since $(\tilde{x}_n)_n \in \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\Delta/10C} \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty)_{\Delta/10C}$, we have that for all n , $\|\tilde{x}_n\| \leq 1 + \delta_n/10C$. Hence

$$|\lambda_k^n| \leq 2C \frac{\|\tilde{x}_n\|}{\|\tilde{z}_k^n\|} \leq 2C \frac{1 + \delta_n/10C}{1 - \delta_k/10C} \leq 2C \frac{1 + \delta_0/10C}{1 - \delta_0/10C} \leq 4C,$$

for all $k \in I_n$.

Therefore, $\|x_n - \tilde{x}_n\| \leq \sum_{k \in I_n} |\lambda_k^n| \|z_k^n - \tilde{z}_k^n\| \leq 4C \sum_{k \in I_n} \frac{\delta_k}{10C} \leq \frac{4}{5} \delta_{\min I_n} \leq \frac{4}{5} \delta_n$. Since $(\tilde{x}_n)_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\Delta/10C}$, the last inequality gives that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\frac{4\Delta}{5} + \frac{\Delta}{10C}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\Delta$. $\square$

The above lemmas lead us to define the next property for a subset $\mathfrak{D}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ and a given sequence $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ of positive real numbers.

($\mathfrak{D}3$) (Δ -block covering property) For every $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty$ there exists $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ such that $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty(\tilde{Z}))_\Delta$.

In the next proposition we give an example of a subset $\mathfrak{D}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ with properties ($\mathfrak{D}1$) – ($\mathfrak{D}3$). Actually we show that a much stronger than ($\mathfrak{D}3$) property can be satisfied. In particular for every $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty$, $\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{z}_n)_n$ setting $Z = (z_n)_n$ with $z_n = \tilde{z}_{2n} + \tilde{z}_{2n+1}$ then $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty(\tilde{Z}))_\Delta$.

Proposition 14. *For every sequence $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ of positive real numbers there is $\mathfrak{D} \subseteq B_{\mathfrak{X}} \cap \langle (e_n)_n \rangle$ satisfying ($\mathfrak{D}1$) – ($\mathfrak{D}3$) and such that $(e_n)_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty$.*

Proof. Let $(k_n)_n$ be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers such that for every n , $2^{-k_n+1} \leq \delta_n$. For $i, l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \geq 1$, let

$$\Lambda(i, l) = \{t \cdot 2^{-l \cdot (k_i+1)} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

For every finite nonempty segment $I = [n_1, n_2]$ of $\mathbb{N}$, $n_1 \leq n_2$, define $\mathfrak{D}(I) = \mathfrak{D}([n_1, n_2])$ to be the set of all $x = \sum_{i=n_1}^{n_2} \lambda_i e_i$ satisfying the following properties.

- (i) For all $n_1 \leq i \leq n_2$, $\lambda_i \in \Lambda(i, l)$, where $l = n_2 - n_1 + 1$ is the length of I .
- (ii) The coefficients λ_{n_1} and λ_{n_2} are both nonzero.
- (iii) $\|x\| \leq 1$.

Finally we set

$$\mathfrak{D} = \bigcup_{n_1 \leq n_2} \mathfrak{D}([n_1, n_2])$$

It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{D}$ satisfies ($\mathfrak{D}1$) – ($\mathfrak{D}2$). In particular $(e_n)_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty$. It remains to show that $\mathfrak{D}$ has the Δ -block covering property. Actually we will prove that $\mathfrak{D}$ has a stronger property and to do this we first state the following.

Claim. Let $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{D}}^\infty$ and let $w \in \langle \tilde{Z} \rangle$ such that $\text{card}(\text{supp}_{\tilde{Z}}(w)) \geq 2$ and $\|w\| \leq 1$. Then there is $\tilde{w} \in \langle \tilde{Z} \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}}$ such that

- (1) $\text{supp}_{\tilde{Z}}(\tilde{w}) = \text{supp}_{\tilde{Z}}(w)$.
- (2) $\|w - \tilde{w}\| \leq 2^{-k_{m_1}+1}$, where $m_1 = \min \text{supp}_{\tilde{Z}}(w)$.

Proof of the claim. Let $\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{z}_j)_j$ and let $(I_j)_j$, $I_j = [n_1(j), n_2(j)]$, $n_1(j) \leq n_2(j)$, be the sequence of successive finite nonempty segments of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{z}_j \in \mathfrak{D}(I_j)$. Let $m_1 < m_2$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and $(\mu_j)_{j=m_1}^{m_2}$ be scalars such that μ_{m_1} , μ_{m_2} are both nonzero and let $w = \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} \mu_j \tilde{z}_j$ in $B_{\mathfrak{X}}$.

Set $w' = (1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}})w = \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} (1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}}) \mu_j \tilde{z}_j$ and $\tilde{w} = \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} \tilde{\mu}_j \tilde{z}_j$, where $\tilde{\mu}_j = s_j \cdot 2^{-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)}$ and if $\mu_j \geq 0$, $s_j = \lceil (1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}}) \mu_j 2^{k_{n_1(j)}+1} \rceil$ while if

$\mu_j < 0$, $s_j = \lfloor (1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}})\mu_j 2^{k_{n_1(j)}+1} \rfloor$, i.e. $\tilde{\mu}_j$ are of the form $s_j \cdot 2^{-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)}$ such that $|\tilde{\mu}_j| \geq |\mu_j(1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}})|$ and $|\tilde{\mu}_j - (1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}})\mu_j| < 2^{-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)}$.

It is easy to see that $\tilde{\mu}_j = 0$ if and only if $\mu_j = 0$ and so $\text{supp}_{\tilde{Z}}(\tilde{w}) = \text{supp}_{\tilde{Z}}(w)$. Moreover for all j , $|(1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}})\mu_j - \tilde{\mu}_j| \leq 2^{-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)}$ and so

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w' - \tilde{w}\| &\leq \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} |(1 - 2^{-k_{m_1}})\mu_j - \tilde{\mu}_j| \|\tilde{z}_j\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} 2^{-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)} \leq 2^{-k_{n_1(m_1)}} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, since $m_1 \leq n_1(m_1)$, $\|w' - \tilde{w}\| \leq 2^{-k_{m_1}}$. As $\|w - w'\| \leq 2^{-k_{m_1}}$, we obtain that $\|w - \tilde{w}\| \leq 2^{-k_{m_1}+1}$.

It remains to show that $\tilde{w} \in \mathfrak{D}$. Since for all $j \in [m_1, m_2]$, $\tilde{z}_j \in \mathfrak{D}(I_j)$, we have that $\tilde{z}_j = \sum_{i \in I_j} t_i^j 2^{-l_j(k_i+1)} e_i$, where $l_j = n_2(j) - n_1(j) + 1$ is the length of I_j and $t_{n_1(j)}^j, t_{n_2(j)}^j$ are both nonzero. Therefore setting $I = [n_1(m_1), n_2(m_2)]$, we have that

$$(2) \quad \tilde{w} = \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} \tilde{\mu}_j \tilde{z}_j = \sum_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} \tilde{\mu}_j \left(\sum_{i \in I_j} t_i^j 2^{-l_j(k_i+1)} e_i \right) = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i e_i$$

where for all $i \in I_j$ and $j \in [m_1, m_2]$, $\lambda_i = t_i^j 2^{-l_j(k_i+1)} \tilde{\mu}_j$ and $\lambda_i = 0$, for all $i \in I \setminus \bigcup_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} I_j$.

We first show that condition (i) of the definition of $\mathfrak{D}$ is satisfied, that is for all $i \in I$, $\lambda_i \in \Lambda(i, l)$ where $l = n_2(m_2) - n_1(m_1) + 1$ is the length of I . Since $0 \in \Lambda(i, l)$, it suffices to check it for each $i \in \bigcup_{j \in [m_1, m_2]} I_j$. So fix $j \in [m_1, m_2]$ and $i \in I_j$. Then

$$(3) \quad \lambda_i = t_i^j 2^{-l_j(k_i+1)} \tilde{\mu}_j = t_i^j 2^{-l_j(k_i+1)} s_j 2^{-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)} = \tau_i^j 2^{-l(k_i+1)}$$

where $\tau_i^j = t_i^j s_j 2^{(l-l_j)(k_i+1)-(k_{n_1(j)}+1)}$. Since $m_1 < m_2$ we have that $l > l_j$. Also $n_1(j) \leq i$ and so $(l-l_j)(k_i+1) - (k_{n_1(j)}+1) \geq 0$. Therefore $\tau_i^j \in \mathbb{Z}$ which gives that $\lambda_i \in \Lambda(i, l)$.

Moreover, since $\tilde{\mu}_{m_1}, \tilde{\mu}_{m_2}, t_{n_1(m_1)}^{m_1}, t_{n_2(m_2)}^{m_2}$ are all non zero we have that $\lambda_{n_1(m_1)}$ and $\lambda_{n_2(m_2)}$ are also non zero and so condition (ii) of the definition of $\mathfrak{D}$ is also satisfied. Finally by (1), $\|\tilde{w}\| \leq \|w'\| + 2^{-k_{n_1(m_1)}} \leq 1$ and so condition (iii) is fulfilled. By the above we have that $\tilde{w} \in \mathfrak{D}$ and the proof of the claim is complete.

We continue with the proof of the proposition. Let $\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{z}_j)_j$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}}^\infty$ and let $Z = (z_j)_j$ where for all j , $z_j = \tilde{z}_{2j} + \tilde{z}_{2j+1}$. Pick $W = (w_i)_i$ in $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z)$. Then for each i there exist $m_1^i < m_2^i$ and scalars $(\mu_j)_j$ such that $w_i = \sum_{j \in [m_1^i, m_2^i]} \mu_j \tilde{z}_j \in B_{\mathfrak{X}}$ and $\mu_{m_1^i}, \mu_{m_2^i}$ are both non zero. By the claim, for each i there exist scalars $(\tilde{\mu}_j)_j$ such that $\tilde{w}_i = \sum_{j \in [m_1^i, m_2^i]} \tilde{\mu}_j \tilde{z}_j \in \mathfrak{D}$ and $\|w_i - \tilde{w}_i\| \leq 2^{-k_{m_1^i}+1} \leq 2^{-k_i+1} \leq \delta_i$. We set $\tilde{W} = (\tilde{w}_i)_i$ and then $\tilde{W} \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}}^\infty(\tilde{Z})$ and $\text{dist}(\tilde{W}, W) \leq \Delta$. Hence $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}}^\infty(\tilde{Z}))_\Delta$ and the proof is complete. $\square$

It is easy to see that $\rho(x, y) = \|x - y\| + |\frac{1}{\|x\|} - \frac{1}{\|y\|}|$, $x, y \in \mathfrak{X} \setminus \{0\}$ is an equivalent metric on $(\mathfrak{X} \setminus \{0\}, \|\cdot\|)$ and that the product topology on $(\mathfrak{X} \setminus \{0\}, \rho)^\mathbb{N}$ makes $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ a Polish space.

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an analytic subset of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ and $\Delta = (\delta_n)_n$ be a sequence of positive real numbers. Then*

- (i) $\mathcal{F}_\Delta$ is analytic in $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$.
- (ii) For every countable $\mathfrak{D} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}$, $\mathcal{F}_\Delta \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$ is analytic in $\mathfrak{D}^\mathbb{N}$ (where $\mathfrak{D}$ is endowed with the discrete topology).

Proof. (i) It is easy to see that $\mathcal{Q} = \{(U, V) : \text{dist}(U, V) \leq \Delta\}$ is closed in $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty \times \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$. Let proj_1 (resp. proj_2) be the projection of $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty \times \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ onto the first (resp. second) coordinate. Then notice that $\mathcal{F}_\Delta = \text{proj}_1[\mathcal{Q} \cap (\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X} \times \mathcal{F})] = \text{proj}_1[\mathcal{Q} \cap \text{proj}_2^{-1}(\mathcal{F})]$. (ii) Let $I : \mathfrak{D}^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^\mathbb{N}$ be the identity map. Then I is clearly continuous and $\mathcal{F}_\Delta \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty = I^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_\Delta)$. $\square$

Theorem 16. (W. T. Gowers) *Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a normed linear space with a basis and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ be an analytic family of block sequences in the unit ball $B_\mathfrak{X}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$. Then for every $\Delta > 0$ there exists a block sequence $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ such that either $\mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z) \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ or player II has a winning strategy in Gowers' game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{F}_\Delta$.*

Proof. Let $(e_n)_n$ be a normalized basis for $\mathfrak{X}$ with constant C . Let $\Delta' = (\delta'_n)_n$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\delta'_0 \leq 1$, $\delta'_n \leq \delta_n$, and $\sum_{i>n} \delta'_i \leq \delta'_n$. By Proposition 14, there is $\mathfrak{D} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}$ with $(e_n)_n \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$ satisfying $(\mathfrak{D}1) - (\mathfrak{D}3)$ for $\Delta'/10C$. Let also $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_{\Delta'/10C} \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$. By Lemma 15, $\mathcal{G}$ is analytic in $\mathfrak{D}^\mathbb{N}$ and applying Theorem 1, we obtain a block sequence $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty$ such that either $\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z}) \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$ or player II has winning strategy in $G_\mathfrak{D}(\tilde{Z})$ for $\mathcal{G}$. Choose $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{X}^\infty$ such that $\mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{D}^\infty(\tilde{Z}))_{\Delta'/10C}$. From Lemmas 12 and 13, we have that either $\mathcal{B}_{B_\mathfrak{X}}^\infty(Z) \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$, or player II has a winning strategy in Gowers' game $G_\mathfrak{X}(Z)$ for $\mathcal{F}_{\Delta'}$ and so (as $\Delta' \leq \Delta$) for $\mathcal{F}_\Delta$ as well. $\square$

5. A RAMSEY CONSEQUENCE ON k -TUPLES OF BLOCK BASES.

The main goal of this section is to prove Theorem 2. First we need to do some preliminary work and introduce some notation. Fix a positive integer $k \geq 2$. For each $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ and every infinite subset $L = \{l_0 < l_1 < \dots\}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ we set $L_{i(\text{mod } k)} = \{l_{kn+i} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and we define

$$([L]^\infty)_\circ^k = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} [L_{i(\text{mod } k)}]^\infty = \{(L_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in ([L]^\infty)^k : \forall i \ L_i \subseteq L_{i(\text{mod } k)}\}$$

Notice that $([L]^\infty)_\circ^k$ is not hereditary, that is generally $([L']^\infty)_\circ^k \not\subseteq ([L]^\infty)_\circ^k$, for $L' \subseteq L$. Let also

$$([L]^\infty)_\perp^k = \{(L_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in ([L]^\infty)^k : \forall i \neq j \ L_i \cap L_j = \emptyset\}$$

We have the following elementary lemma which relates the above types of products.

Lemma 17. *Let $N = \{(2n+1)k : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then $([N]^\infty)_\perp^k \subseteq \bigcup_{L \in [\mathbb{N}]^\infty} ([L]^\infty)_\circ^k$.*

Proof. Let $(M_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in ([N]^\infty)_\perp^k$. Let $M = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} M_i$ and for each $m \in M$ define the interval $I_m = [m - i_m, m - i_m + k - 1]$ of $\mathbb{N}$ where i_m is the unique natural number i such that $m \in M_i$. Notice that the length of all I_m is k while the length of an interval with nonequal endpoints in N is at least $2k+1$. Hence for $m_1 \neq m_2$, $I_{m_1} \cap I_{m_2} = \emptyset$ and for all $m \in M$, $I_m \cap N = \{m\}$.

Let $L = \bigcup_{m \in M} I_m$. We claim that $(M_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in ([L]^\infty)_\circ^k$. Indeed, let $L = (l_n)_n$ be the increasing enumeration of L . For each $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $m \in M$ let $I_m(i) = m - i_m + i$ be the i^{th} -element of I_m . Since $(I_m)_{m \in M}$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint intervals of $\mathbb{N}$ of length k , we easily see that $L_{i(\text{mod } k)} = \bigcup_{m \in M} I_m(i)$. Fix

$0 \leq i \leq k-1$. Then $m \in M_i$ if and only if $i_m = i$ if and only if $I_m(i) = m$. Hence $M_i = \bigcup_{m \in M_i} \{I_m(i)\} \subseteq \bigcup_{m \in M} \{I_m(i)\} = L_{i(\text{mod } k)}$. $\square$

The above notation is easily extended to block sequences in the unit ball $B_{\mathfrak{X}}$ of a Banach space $\mathfrak{X}$ as follows. For every $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ let

$$(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z))_\circ^k = \{(Z_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty)^k : \forall i \ Z_i \preceq Z|_{\mathbb{N}_{i(\text{mod } k)}}\}$$

and generally for $L \in [\mathbb{N}]^\infty$, we set

$$(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z|_L))_\circ^k = \{(Z_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty)^k : \forall i \ Z_i \preceq Z|_{L_{i(\text{mod } k)}}\}$$

The next lemma is an immediate consequence of Lemma 17.

Lemma 18. *Let $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$ and $N = \{(2n+1)k : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then*

$$(\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z|_N))_\perp^k \subseteq \bigcup_{L \in [\mathbb{N}]^\infty} (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z|_L))_\circ^k.$$

For a family $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty)^k$ let

$$\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F} = \{Z \in \mathcal{B}_{S_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty : \mathfrak{F} \cap (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z))_\circ^k \neq \emptyset\},$$

where $S_{\mathfrak{X}}$ is the unit sphere of $\mathfrak{X}$.

Lemma 19. *If $\mathfrak{F}$ is analytic in $(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty)^k$, then $\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{S_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty$ is analytic in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{(Z, (V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_{S_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty \times (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty)^k : (V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z))_\circ^k\}$. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty \times (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty)^k$ and that $\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F} = \text{proj}_1[(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty \times \mathfrak{F}) \cap \mathcal{K}]$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2: Let $(e_n)_n$ be a normalized basis of $\mathfrak{X}$ with basis constant C . Choose $\Delta' = (\delta'_n)_n$ such that $0 < \delta'_n \leq (4C)^{-1}\delta_n$ and $\sum_{j=n+1}^\infty \delta'_j \leq \delta'_n$. By Lemma 19, we have that $\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F}$ is an analytic subset of $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty$ and by Theorem 16 there is a block subsequence $Z = (z_n)_n$ such that either $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z) \cap \mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F} = \emptyset$ or player II has winning strategy in Gowers' game $G_{\mathfrak{X}}(Z)$ for $(\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F})_{\Delta'}$. Let $Y = Z|_N$, where $N = \{(2n+1)k : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We claim that Y satisfies the conclusion of the theorem.

Indeed, if $\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z) \cap \mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F} = \emptyset$ then for all $Z' \in \mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z)$, $\mathfrak{F} \cap (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z'))_\circ^k = \emptyset$. In particular for all $L \in [\mathbb{N}]^\infty$, $\mathfrak{F} \cap (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Z|_L))_\circ^k = \emptyset$ which by Lemma 18 gives that $\mathfrak{F} \cap (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Y))_\perp^k = \emptyset$.

So let us assume that player II has a winning strategy in Gowers' game $G_{\mathfrak{X}}(Z)$ for $(\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F})_{\Delta'}$. Since $Y = Z|_N$ the same holds for the game $G_{\mathfrak{X}}(Y)$. Fix $(U_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(Y))_\circ^k$. We have to show that there exists $(V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{X}}^\infty)^k$ such that $V_i \preceq U_i$ and $(V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in \mathfrak{F}_\Delta$. Consider a run of the game such that in the n^{th} -move player I plays U_i , where $n = i(\text{mod } k)$. Then player II succeeds to construct a block sequence $V = (v_n)_n$ in $(\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F})_{\Delta'}$ such that $v_n \in U_i$ for all $n = i(\text{mod } k)$. Choose W in $\mathcal{F}^\mathfrak{F}$ with $\text{dist}(V, W) \leq \Delta'$ and for each i , $W_i \preceq W|_{\mathbb{N}_{i(\text{mod } k)}}$ such that $(W_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathcal{B}_{B_{\mathfrak{X}}}^\infty(W))_\circ^k \cap \mathfrak{F}$. Let $W = (w_n)_n$ and $W_i = (w_n^i)_n$. Then for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ there is a block sequence $(F_n^i)_n$ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}_{i(\text{mod } k)}$ and a sequence of scalars $(\lambda_j)_j$ such that for all i and all n , $w_n^i = \sum_{j \in F_n^i} \lambda_j w_j$. We set $v_n^i = \sum_{j \in F_n^i} \lambda_j v_j$ and let $V_i = (v_n^i)_n$. Then for all i , $V_i \preceq V|_{\mathbb{N}_{i(\text{mod } k)}} \preceq U_i$. It remains to show that $(V_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in \mathfrak{F}_\Delta$. For this it suffices to see that $\text{dist}(V_i, W_i) \leq \Delta$, for all i . Indeed fix

$0 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\|w_n^i\| \leq 1$ and $\|w_j\| = 1$, we get that $|\lambda_j| \leq 2C$ and therefore

$$\|v_n^i - w_n^i\| \leq \sum_{j \in F_n^i} |\lambda_j| \|v_j - w_j\| \leq 2C \sum_{j \in F_n^i} \delta'_j \leq 4C\delta'_n \leq \delta_n$$

Hence $(U_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \in (\mathfrak{F}_\Delta)^\uparrow$. $\square$

6. COMMENTS

1. C. Rosendal in [21] proves a Ramsey dichotomy between winning strategies in Gowers' game and winning strategies in the infinite asymptotic game. By appropriately modifying his argument, one can check that the proof in [21] works in the more general setting of a linear space $\mathfrak{X}$ of countable dimension over the field of reals provided that both games are restricted on a *countable* subset $\mathfrak{D}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ satisfying property $(\mathfrak{D}1)$ stated in the introduction. This modification can be used to derive an alternative proof of Theorem 1.

2. Theorem 2 is actually an extension of the following fact concerning pairs of infinite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. Given an analytic family $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^\infty \times [\mathbb{N}]^\infty$ there is an infinite subset L of $\mathbb{N}$ such that either all *disjoint* pairs of infinite subsets of L belong to the complement of $\mathfrak{F}$ or for every $(L_1, L_2) \in [L]^\infty \times [L]^\infty$, there is $(L'_1, L'_2) \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ for all $i = 1, 2$. To see this consider the map $\Phi : M \rightarrow (M_0, M_1)$ where if $M = \{m_i\}_i$ is the increasing enumeration of L then $M_0 = \{m_i\}_{i \text{ even}}$ and $M_1 = \{m_i\}_{i \text{ odd}}$. Then apply Silver's theorem (see [23]) for the family $\Phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{F}^\uparrow)$ where $\mathfrak{F}^\uparrow = \{(L, M) : \exists (L', M') \in \mathfrak{F} \text{ with } L' \subseteq L \text{ and } M' \subseteq M\}$. It is easy to see that keeping the "half" of the monochromatic set the result follows. Also, applying K. Milliken's theorem [16], one can derive an analogue of the above result for pairs of block sequences of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank the referee for his (or her) suggestions which simplified the proof of Theorem 1.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Androulakis, S. J. Dilworth, and N. J. Kalton, *A new approach to the Ramsey-type games and the Gowers dichotomy in F-spaces*, to appear in *Combinatorica*.
- [2] S.A. Argyros and S. Todorćević, *Ramsey Methods in Analysis*, Advanced Courses in Mathematics, CRM Barcelona, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [3] J. Bagaria and J. Lopez- Abad, *Weakly Ramsey sets in Banach spaces*, *Adv. in Math.*, 160, (2001), 133-174.
- [4] J. Bagaria and J. Lopez- Abad, *Determinacy and weakly Ramsey sets in Banach spaces*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 354, (2002), 1327-1349.
- [5] E. Ellentuck, *A new proof that analytic sets are Ramsey*, *J. Symb. Logic*, 39, (1974), 163-165.
- [6] V. Ferenczi and C. Rosendal, *Banach spaces without minimal subspaces*, *J. of Funct. Anal.* *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 257, Issue 1, (2009), 149-193.
- [7] T. Figiel, R. Frankiewicz, R. Komorowski, C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *On hereditarily indecomposable Banach spaces*, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 126, (2004), 293-299.
- [8] T. Figiel, R. Frankiewicz, R. Komorowski, C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *Selecting basic sequences in ϕ -stable Banach spaces*, *Studia Mathematica*, 159, (2003), 499-515.
- [9] F. Galvin and K. Prikry, *Borel sets and Ramsey's theorem*, *J. Symb. Logic*, 38, (1973), 193-198.
- [10] W.T. Gowers, *A New Dichotomy for Banach Spaces*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 6, (1996), 1083-1093.

- [11] W.T. Gowers, *An Infinite Ramsey Theorem and some Banach-Space Dichotomies*, Ann. of Math, 156, (2002), 797-833.
- [12] W.T. Gowers, *Ramsey Methods in Banach Spaces*, Handbook of the geometry of Banach Spaces, vol. 2, (2003) Elsevier Science B.V., 1072-1097.
- [13] A.S. Kechris, *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [14] J. Lopez-Abad, *Coding into Ramsey sets*, Math. Annal., 332, 4, (2005), 775-794.
- [15] B. Maurey, *A note on Gowers' dichotomy theorem*, Convex Geometric Analysis, vol. 34, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, (1999), 149-157.
- [16] K. Milliken, *Ramsey's theorem with sums and unions*, J. Combin. Theory (A), 18, (1975), 276-290.
- [17] C.St.J.A. Nash-Williams, *On well quasi-ordering transfinite sequences*, Proc. Cambr. Phil. Soc., 61, (1965), 33-39.
- [18] A. M. Pelczar, *Some version of Gowers' dichotomy for Banach spaces*, Univ. Iagel. Acta Math., 41, (2003), 235-243.
- [19] A. M. Pelczar, *Subsymmetric sequences and minimal spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 131 (2003), 765-771.
- [20] P. Pudlak and V. Rodl, *Partition theorems for systems of finite subsets of integers*, Discr. Math., 39, (1982), 67-73.
- [21] C. Rosendal, *An exact Ramsey principle for block sequences*, to appear in Collectanea Mathematica.
- [22] C. Rosendal, *Infinite asymptotic games*, Ann.de l'Inst. Fourier, 59, (2009), 1323-1348.
- [23] J. Silver, *Every analytic set is Ramsey*, J. Symb. Logic, 35, (1970), 60-64.
- [24] A. Tcaciuc, *On the existence of asymptotic- l_p structures in Banach spaces*, Canad. Math. Bull. 50 (2007), no. 4, 619-631.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZOGRAFOU CAMPUS, 157 80, ATHENS, GREECE

E-mail address: bkanel@math.ntua.gr, ktyros@central.ntua.gr